

**REMARKS**

The present Amendment amends claims 1, 6, 11, 15 and 16, cancels claims 5, 10, 14, 17 and 18 and leaves claims 3, 8, and 12 unchanged. Therefore, the present application has pending claims 1, 3, 6, 8, 11, 12, 15 and 16.

**Allowable Subject Matter**

The Examiner indicated that claims 5, 10, and 14 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the claim objections set forth in the Office Action, and to include all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

It is noted that the Office Action dated March 13, 2009 does not contain any claim objections, and the claim objections made in the Office Action dated November 20, 2007 are believed to be overcome.

Furthermore, independent claims 1, 6 and 11 were amended to include the allowable features of claims 5, 10 and 14, respectively. Accordingly, claims 1, 6 and 11, and their respective dependent claims, are in condition for allowance.

Further, as indicated in several phone messages left with the Examiner in March and April 2009, claims 17 and 18 were not examined. However, it is noted that dependent claims 17 and 18 are directed to the allowable subject matter of claim 10, and independent claims 15 and 16 were amended to include the allowable features of claims 17 and 18, respectively. Accordingly, claims 15 and 16 are in condition for allowance.

**35 U.S.C. §103 Rejections**

Claims 15 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,634,122 to Loucks et al. ("Loucks") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,175,851 to Johnson et al. ("Johnson"). This rejection is traversed

for the following reasons. As previously indicated, claims 15 and 16 were amended to include the subject matter of allowable claims 17 and 18, respectively. Therefore, claims 15 and 16 should be allowed.

Claims 6 and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Loucks in view of Johnson, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,884,308 to Foulston. This rejection is traversed for the following reasons. As previously indicated, claim 6 was amended to include the allowable features of claim 10. Therefore, claims 6 and 8 should be allowed.

Claims 1, 3, 11 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Loucks in view of Johnson, further in view of Foulston, and even further in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0110117 to Saidenberg et al. (“Saidenberg”). This rejection is traversed for the following reasons. As previously indicated, claims 1 and 11 were amended to include the allowable features of claims 5 and 14, respectively. Therefore, claims 1, 3, 11 and 12 should be allowed.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that claims 1, 3, 6, 8, 11, 12, 15 and 16 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance of claims 1, 3, 6, 8, 11, 12, 15 and 16 is respectfully requested.

To the extent necessary, Applicants petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment of fees, to the deposit account of Brundidge & Stanger, P.C., Deposit Account No. 50-4888 (referencing Attorney Docket No. 1213.43347X00).

Respectfully submitted,

BRUNDIDGE & STANGER, P.C.

/DONNA K. MASON/

Donna K. Mason  
Registration No. 45,962

DKM/kah  
(703) 684-1470